

Application No.: 09/527,350
Amendment dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action states that this Office Action is in response to the communication filed on March 17, 2000 (filing date of the application). A Preliminary Amendment was filed on November 24, 2000 (mailed to the PTO on November 20, 2000) which amended claims 1-27 and the specification.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claim 26 is objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,604 to Yamazaki et al ("Yamazaki") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,569 to Matsuzaki et al ("Matsuzaki").

The acknowledgement, in the Office Action, of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and that the certified copy of the priority document has been received, is noted with appreciation.

In the Preliminary Amendment filed November 24, 2000 (mailed to the PTO on November 20, 2000) it incorrectly stated that amendment changes were to be made on page 21, line 5. It should have stated page 21, line 15.

Please note that an Information Disclosure Statement, along with a PTO Form 1449 (2 pages), was filed on June 30, 2000 (mailed to the PTO on June 28, 2000); however, we have only received an initialed copy of page 1 of the PTO Form 1449 by the Examiner. Enclosed is a copy of the two page PTO Form 1449. Acknowledgment of receipt of this document is respectfully requested.

The indication, in the Office Action, that the Examiner has approved the proposed drawing correction to Fig. 18 of the drawings filed on November 24, 2000 (mailed to the

PTO on November 20, 2000), is noted with appreciation. The formal replacement drawing is being submitted herewith.

The objection to the title of the invention as not being descriptive is noted and a new title is presented in this Amendment which is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claim 26, as previously presented, shows dependency from itself. Claim 26, as currently amended, now depends from claim 25. This change is not necessitated by the prior art, is unrelated to the patentability of the invention over the prior art, and does not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yamazaki in view of Matsuzaki, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

a controller which, in response to a command to turn off the electric power source which is issued while the display is performing writing by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, turns off the electric power source after completion of the writing.

Thus, claim 1 requires that a command to turn off the electric power source be issued while the display is performing writing.

Yamazaki discloses a computer system having a circuit for detecting writing to a video memory and a power management program for managing power. When writing to the video memory is performed, a shift to the power saving mode is inhibited, even though there is no input at the keyboard during the predetermined time period. (Abstract). The

system of Yamazaki is designed to avoid the situation where the display is turned off while a user is watching, for example, an animated graphic display from a CD-ROM. (Col. 1, lines 28-33). In power saving mode, the display is typically turned off as the computer enters standby mode due to the lack of user input at the keyboard or mouse.

Yamazaki employs a timer to measure a period of time that elapses from the time of the last input by a user using a keyboard or a mouse. (Col. 5, lines 16-19). If there has been user input (Yes at block 73), the timing value is reset (at block 74). (Col. 5, lines 19-23; Fig. 7). If there has been no user input (No at block 73), program control then checks (at block 75) to determine whether a video memory write bit is ON. (Col. 5, lines 23-26; Fig. 7). If the video memory write bit is ON (Yes at block 75), program control returns to block 74 where the timing value is reset. (Col. 5, lines 31-34; Fig. 7). Thus, the system of Yamazaki allows the user to watch the display without having to provide periodic inputs to the keyboard or mouse to avoid entering standby mode.

In the system of Yamazaki, the command to shift to standby mode (block 78) is generated only if there is (1) no user input (No at block 73), (2) no writing to video memory (No at block 75), and (3) a predetermined amount of time has elapsed (block 77). Thus, as long as writing to the display is occurring, (i.e., the video memory write bit is ON in block 75), the program control of Yamazaki can never reach block 78 where the command to shift to standby mode (i.e., to turn off the display) is issued. Therefore, in contrast to claim 1 of the present invention, the system of Yamazaki cannot issue a command to turn off the electric power source while the display is performing writing.

Matsuzaki discloses a display control apparatus and method that, when a power-off operation is detected, the state of the memory means corresponding to a display frame is initialized so as to erase an image currently displayed. (Col. 2, lines 3-7). Matsuzaki does not rectify the deficiencies of Yamazaki, in that Matsuzaki does not disclose a system in which a command to turn off a display is issued while the display is performing writing.

Rather, the method disclosed in Matsuzaki only occurs after the request for power disconnection is received.

Thus, neither Yamazaki nor Matsuzaki, individually or in combination, discloses a command to turn off the electric power source which is issued while the display is performing writing as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 1. Since claim 1 is novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, claims 2-4 are also novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5 recites:

An electronic information device comprising:
 a display which uses a material having a memory effect;
 an electric power source for supplying driving power to the display;
and
 a controller for performing the following processes:
 an automatic power-off process which turns off the electric
power source automatically at a specified time; and
 a delay process which, when the display is performing
writing by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power
source, delays execution of the automatic power-off process so that the
electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing.

As discussed above, Yamazaki discloses a computer system that does not enter standby mode (due to the lack of user input at a keyboard or mouse) as long as writing to the video memory is being performed (i.e., the video memory write bit is ON).

The Office Action is correct that Matsuzaki discloses a display having a memory effect. However, as discussed above, Matsuzaki discloses a system that, when a power-off operation is detected, initializes the state of the memory means so as to erase the currently displayed image. For security reasons (e.g., the display may contain an image carrying

confidential information (col. 1, lines 64-66), Matsuzaki does not want the last image to be retained after power off and thus erases the displayed image upon power-off.

The Office Action seeks to combine the teachings of Yamazaki and Matsuzaki to arrive at the invention of claim 5. However, the combination of Yamazaki and Matsuzaki would result in a system wherein the displayed image is erased upon power off. In contrast, the invention of claim 5 utilizes the display having a memory effect so as to allow an image to remain on the display even after power off. By providing "a delay process which, ... delays execution of the automatic power-off process so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing" the invention of claim 5 avoids the situation where power is turned off before the complete image can be written to the display, resulting in an incomplete image on the display.

Thus, since neither Yamazaki nor Matsuzaki, individually or in combination, discloses all of the features of claim 5, claim 5 is considered novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki.

Claims 6-10 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 5. Since claim 5 is novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, claims 6-10 are also novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki for at least the same reasons.

Claim 11 recites, in part:

a first input member with which an operator inputs a specified command; and
a controller which, when the first input member is operated while writing on the display is being performed, invalidates the command ...

Thus, the command is input while writing on the display is being performed.

As discussed above, neither Yamazaki nor Matsuzaki discloses a command which is issued while the display is performing writing. Thus, claim 11 is considered novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, individually or in combination.

Claims 12-14 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 11. Since claim 11 is novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, claims 12-14 are also novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki for at least the same reasons.

Claim 15 recites, in part:

commanding a power-off of the electric power source; and
when a power-off of the electric power source is commanded while the display is performing writing by consuming electric power supplied from the electric power source, executing the power-off command after completion of the writing.

As discussed above, neither Yamazaki nor Matsuzaki discloses a power-off command which is commanded while the display is performing writing. Thus, claim 15 is considered novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, individually or in combination.

Claims 16-18 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 15. Since claim 15 is novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, claims 16-18 are also novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki for at least the same reasons.

Claim 19 recites, in part:

a delay step of, when writing on the display is being performed, delaying execution of the power-off step so that the electric power source is turned off after completion of the writing.

As discussed above, Matsuzaki discloses a system that, when a power-off operation is detected, initializes the memory so as to erase the displayed image. Thus, the combination of Matsuzaki and Yamazaki would result in a system wherein the displayed

image is erased upon power off. In contrast, the invention of claim 19 is capable of providing a complete image on the display after power off. By providing the delay step, claim 19 avoids the situation where power is turned off before the complete image is written to the display.

Thus, since the combination of Yamazaki and Matsuzaki does not disclose all of the features of claim 19, claim 19 is considered novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki.

Claims 20-23 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 19. Since claim 19 is novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, claims 20-23 are also novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki for at least the same reasons.

Claim 24 recites, in part:

issuing a specified command by operating a first input member; and
when the first input member is operated while writing on the display
is being performed, invalidating the command sent from the first input
member

Thus, the specified command is input while writing on the display is being performed.

As discussed above, neither Yamazaki nor Matsuzaki discloses a command which is issued while the display is performing writing. Thus, claim 24 is considered novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, individually or in combination.

Claims 25-27 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 24. Since claim 24 is novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki, claims 25-27 are also novel and non-obvious over Yamazaki and Matsuzaki for at least the same reasons.

Application No.: 09/527,350
Amendment dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2003

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yamazaki in view of Matsuzaki, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 28 and 29 have been added to provide a more adequate basis for protection of the invention. No new matter has been added. Of the newly added claims, claim 28 depends from claim 5 and claim 29 depends from claim 19. Thus, new claims 28 and 29 are considered to patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5 and 19.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent, increases the total number of claims by 2 from 27 to 29, but does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, a Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form authorizing the amount of \$36.00 to be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260 is enclosed herewith in duplicate. However, if the Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form is missing, insufficient, or otherwise inadequate, or if a fee, other than the issue fee, is required during the pendency of this application, please charge such fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.


Application No.: 09/527,350
Amendment dated January 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2003

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


Tung T. Nguyen
Registration No. 42,935
Attorney for Applicants

TTN/llb:bar:jkk
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3478
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
January 8, 2004

DA1 279487v5